

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are currently active.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 15 and 16 have been amended. Antecedent support for the amendment to these claims is found in figure 1.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings. The drawings have been amended, as shown in red. Formal drawings will be provided when the application is allowed.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The figures are amended to show the opening of a metal heat plate. Respectfully, it is pointed out on page 4, lines 5-10, this language is supported in the specification. This language is definite to one skilled in the art.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4. In regard to the claims, as amended, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Schafer fails to teach the limitation that "the housing having a first wall, a second wall in spaced relation, opposing and in parallel with the first wall, the third wall connected to and in perpendicular relation with the first wall and second wall; and a fourth wall connected to and in perpendicular relation with the first wall

and the second wall and in spaced relation and in parallel with the third wall". Accordingly, Claims 1-4, 15 and 16 are patentable over Schafer.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 as being anticipated by Strafford. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the same reasons these claims are patentable over Schafer.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 15 as being anticipated by Usher. In view of the amendments to Claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 15 is patentable over Usher.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3-14 as being unpatentable over Strafford. Claims 3-14 are dependent to parent Claim 1 and are patentable over Strafford for the reasons Claim 1 is patentable. Furthermore, in regard to the Examiner's argument that it is a simple design choice for the rectangular shape, applicant respectfully strongly traverses this conclusion. The rectangular shape is critical to the design of applicant's claimed invention. As explained in the background of the invention of the above-identified patent application, an important element of the claimed invention is the ascetic and artistic quality it affords to the functional aspect of lighting. The rectangular shape was chosen as an important structural feature because of the way that the claimed invention can be situated in a building structure so

the area behind a light does not distract or provide for any indication of its presence. Strafford does not even come close to a rectangular shape in its teachings, and a rectangular shape would have no meaning in regard to Strafford.

Accordingly, Claims 1-16 are patentable over the applied art of record.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections and objections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn, and Claims 1-16, now in this application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

IRWIN KOTOVSKY

By Ansel M. Schwartz


Ansel M. Schwartz, Esquire  
Reg. No. 30,587  
One Sterling Plaza  
201 N. Craig Street  
Suite 304  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213  
(412) 621-9222

Attorney for Applicant

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that the correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents,  
Washington, D.C. 20331

on 3/3/04

  
Ansel M. Schwartz  
Registration No. 30,587  
3/3/04  
Date